



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ment of the skull. Aeby says point blank, that the cranial form affords no certain means for a proper classification of races—but if the most important part of the body does not furnish us with a starting point for classification, then we ought to give up the attempt. But the want of success may perhaps be owing to a false method of investigation. Another error which underlies many views on cranial formation is this, that we search in nature for fixed types which do not exist in it. Even that form which we call dolichocephalic or brachycephalic, though probably of different origin, is not immutable. The form of a cranium is first determined by hereditary disposition, which may be altered by the influences of aliment, climate, muscular action, mental development, and intermixture with another type. Muscular pressure may have rendered the originally brachycephalic crania of the Esquimaux and Polynesians long and narrow, and the long and narrow skulls of pre-historic times may, by mental culture, have become broader in France, Germany, and elsewhere.

From what precedes, we may consider the axiom as established, that a skull which does not present the characters of a low organisation cannot be considered as belonging to the primitive man, although the skull may be found associated with the remains of extinct animals. It follows further, that we must place the primitive man lower in the scale than the rudest living savage. The Neander-skull and the La Naulette jaw present characters of a low organisation, such as we do not find in any living race. No doubt it is a great loss to science that we possess only a few fragments of the human organisation of the remotest periods. Our imagination must try, supported by the laws of organic formation, to collect the scattered parts of the primitive man, and to construct his frame ; until the time arrives when a happy find may confirm our speculations and deductions relating to a question, which hitherto inaccessible to science, has become the most important of anthropological inquiries.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL REVIEW AND ITS CONNECTION WITH THE ANTHRO- POLOGICAL SOCIETY.

In closing our sixth volume, we purpose to give a short history of the origin of the *Review*, and to address a few words to our readers on the subject of the connection which has existed between it and the Anthropological Society of London. We have hitherto been too much en-

grossed with subjects of scientific interest and importance to devote much space to our relations with the Anthropological Society of London, and too much concerned with the present to even glance at our origin and past history. Fourteen years ago, a Fellow of the present Anthropological Society of London became a student of the writings of Knox and Lawrence. Soon afterwards he became personally acquainted with the great modern British philosophical anatomist and physiologist, whose cruel history has yet to be written. It is necessary for us to go back to this period, because at that time were commenced the labours which finally produced this *Review*. At that date (1854), anthropology in England was at an extremely low ebb. Prichard was dead, Lawrence was silent, Knox was an outcast, Crawford took no part, and was not even a member of the only body which then existed in England for the cultivation of any portion of anthropological science. The Ethnological Society, which had been started ten years before, was in a dying condition. It only held seven meetings in the year, and these were but thinly attended. So scarce were original papers, that the meetings were not unfrequently eked out by the reading of extracts from books of travels. Whilst in a state of utter depression, the late lamented Mr. John Crawford, in the year 1858, became a Fellow of the Society, and was nominated as President on the same day. From this time may be dated the *renaissance* of the Ethnological Society. Both President and other officers worked energetically in its behalf, and their joint labours soon resulted in financial improvement and marked progress throughout. Prior to Mr. Crawford's occupying the presidential chair, his views on certain scientific subjects had been far from popular with a faction of Quakers, who, headed by Dr. Hodgkin, were then dominant in the Society; and neither friendly nor respectful were the terms in which Mr. Crawford and his opinions were spoken of. It may be mentioned also, as a further example of the state of scientific feeling thirteen years ago, that the late Dr. Robert Knox was, in the year 1855, proposed an ordinary Fellow of the Society, and black-balled! He was, however, elected in 1858 an Honorary Fellow, to the horror and indignation of the Quakers. It would be wrong to conclude this part of our subject without a passing notice of Sir James Clark, Bart., who was President of the Society before Mr. Crawford. We do not hesitate to assert that no president of any scientific society ever performed his duty more conscientiously than did this distinguished physician. The conflicting elements with which he had to deal, however, and the little interest evinced in ethnological questions, even within the Society itself at that time, gave him few opportunities of raising the standard of scientific opinion during his régime. At the anniversary meeting of 1858, this

utter indifference came to a culminating point—the meeting consisting of but six members, the President Sir James Clark, three officers, and two other members ! Nor was even this extremely select gathering by any means unanimous in sentiment, a vote of thanks to the President and Council failing to find a seconder. It was the conviction that but little good could be achieved in arousing a spirit of inquiry into the most important scientific questions of the day without some organ specially devoted to the subject of the study of the races and science of man, that led to the organisation of our present periodical.

It was in the autumn of 1859 that a prospectus was first drawn up of a quarterly journal on these subjects, and was even put up in type—the proposed title being, “The Quarterly Journal of Ethnology.” Further preparations were also made for it by the translation of some of the foreign recent literature relating to the study of man, and both Dr. Knox and Mr. Crawford promised their active support and co-operation. Shortly after an application was made to Mr. Luke Burke, who, in 1848, edited the *Ethnological Journal*, to enter into the scheme. He was at the time, however, too much engrossed with other subjects to occupy himself with the proposed quarterly.

Other obstacles also intervened, and the plan remained in abeyance ; the idea was, however, never abandoned, and many valuable works were translated and matter collected, with a view to quarterly publication when the time for it should arrive. In the year 1862 it was finally resolved to carry out this plan ; but an Anthropological Society being started in England some few months later, and a quarterly journal of anthropological science forming a part of the programme of that Society, our present publication was issued conjointly with the Society’s official journal. It must, however, be clearly explained that, although this connection exists between the Anthropological Society and our *Review*, the former has never been answerable for any expenses which have been incurred in bringing out the *Review*, beyond paying at a fixed rate per number for copies actually taken by the Society—whether few or many—and which payment, be it remembered, includes the printing, binding, and advertising the journal of the Society.

We shall not here enter upon the differences within the Ethnological Society, which partly gave rise to the foundation of the Anthropological Society, and at any rate hastened it. We may state, however, that one of the earliest matters of dispute was with respect to the admission of ladies to the meetings of the Society. And here we had, perhaps, better quote the words of the Founder of the Society, written in 1864. They appear in the dedication of Carl Vogt’s *Lectures on Man* to Professor Broca, and run as follows :—

"Some seven years since, when I first had the honour of being introduced to you by our late lamented colleague, Dr. Robert Knox, I held, as you may remember, the office of Honorary Secretary to the Ethnological Society of London. Most heartily did I welcome the birth of your Society, on behalf of that of which I was then an officer, believing at that time the Société d'Anthropologie de Paris to be merely an Ethnological Society under another name. In watching the development of your Society, and tracing the vastness of its extent and objects, under the administration of yourself and your illustrious colleague, I soon perceived that pure ethnology merely formed a part of the grand science then inaugurated by you. With the most intense pleasure and admiration I witnessed the gradual establishment and progress of your Society, endeavouring, at the same time, with all my power to incite the Ethnological Society to similar efforts. This attempt, however (truth compels me to record), proved a signal failure—a circumstance which caused me disappointment at the moment, but which I now consider fortunate; for I soon became aware that anthropology and ethnology could never become synonymous terms, inasmuch as the latter merely constitutes a part of the comprehensive science of anthropology.

"I am glad to state that, at the present time, this profound distinction is fully admitted by unbiassed persons in England. My failure, however, in arousing the Ethnological Society from its torpor, was not attributable to this confusion of terms, the matter not having then received public attention in this country, but arose entirely from the opposite views held by myself and my colleagues as to the objects of the Ethnological Society, and its duties as a scientific body.

"The stand-point claimed for the science of ethnology by the late Dr. Knox, by Captain R. F. Burton, the present senior Vice-President of the London Anthropological Society, by myself, and by some others, was that of a grave, erudite, and purely scientific study, requiring the most free and serious discussion, especially on anatomical and physiological topics, for the elucidation of the many difficult problems arising out of the subjects brought forward. This, however, was far from being the opinion of a large and powerful section of the Society, headed by my venerable friend, Mr. John Crawfurd. The party under his leadership desired to place the Ethnological Society on a footing with the Royal Geographical Society, and to render its meetings fashionable and popular by the admission of ladies. You will, doubtless, smile at the strange idea of admitting females to a discussion of all ethnological subjects. However, the supporters of the "fair sex" won the day, and females have been regularly admitted to

the meetings of the Ethnological Society during the past three years.

"Even now the advocates of this measure do not admit their error, nor do they perceive how they are practically hindering the promotion of those scientific objects which they continue to claim for their Society. On the contrary, they rejoice at their victory, and Mr. Crawford has publicly, on more than one occasion, ascribed the success which attended the Ethnological Society under his régime to the admission of ladies.

"Apart from this fatal mistake, you will readily understand that other important, and indeed vital, differences existed as to the mode in which such a society should be conducted. Finding myself, therefore, unable to give my cordial support to a society whose apparent objects were so utterly at variance with my own views—views in which I was not without supporters—the idea occurred to me of establishing in this country a really scientific society, which, taking yours as a model, might become worthy of a great nation."

We have endeavoured to explain clearly to our readers that our present quarterly owes its origin, not so much to the formation of the Anthropological Society—it having been prepared to appear before the world had that Society never come into existence—as to the marked change in the public mind, which had become aroused to the importance of the study of man under all phases of his history. The change of title from that originally intended, namely, from "The Quarterly Journal of Ethnology" to "The Anthropological Review" (published quarterly), although no absolute change was made in the original plan and leading objects of the publication, allowed scope for a wider range of subjects than would have been admissible under the earlier designation.

It will thus be seen that this *Review* owes its origin to other causes than the existence of the Anthropological Society. By a happy accident, or by a well-conceived design, the two schemes have worked in harmony, and, we believe, have been mutually beneficial. Those who are competent judges on such a point, like Sir Roderick Murchison, we believe have expressed their opinion that the unexampled success of the Anthropological Society is due very largely to the existence of the *Anthropological Review*. When it was finally decided to publish the first number of this *Review*, a letter was addressed to the secretaries of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies, offering to print their Journal or Proceedings at the end of the *Anthropological Review*. Identical terms were offered to both societies: one refused, and the other accepted. Here we cannot but think that the Ethnological Society made a very great mistake. Had

it accepted the terms offered, it might now be able fairly to encounter the society which accepted it. In this case a contemporary would not have lent its pages to the publication of ludicrous letters, containing false and calumnious charges against ourselves and the Anthropological Society. It is the very success of the Anthropological Society which has aroused so many enemies, not only amongst the masses of the people, but amongst a somewhat exclusive *coterie* who believe themselves to be the only scientific men of the day. We have long heard it hinted that the arrangement existing between the *Review* and the Society was novel in the history of scientific societies, and that it must not be allowed to exist! Such ideas are worthy of the men who uttered them. We have as much respect for the dignity of scientific societies as any-one; but we fail to see why it is necessary that they should all be modelled on the same plan; or, more especially, why such plan should be that which was originated two centuries ago.

Our original arrangement with the Anthropological Society was as follows. Our publisher undertook to print the official Journal of the Society at the end of each number of the *Anthropological Review*, on condition that the Society took a copy, at trade price, of the joint publication for each paying Fellow. In other words, instead of going to the expense of printing and binding their own Journal, they engaged to accept the offer, and thus to save themselves, at that time, at least, much unnecessary cost. Now, the *Review* and *Journal* are supplied to the Society for about 2s. 3d. per copy, and the printing and all other expenses connected with their Journal, is included in this amount.

It will probably be a matter of surprise to that majority of our readers who are unacquainted with the details of literary work, when they are informed of the actual cost of bringing out such a publication as ours; nor should we have alluded to a topic which both custom and good taste usually keep in the background, had not a faction lately introduced the subject of the finances of the Anthropological Society to the public in a spirit neither friendly to ourselves, nor tending either to promote the cause of science, or serve the Society, on whose behalf, but without whose sanction, they appear to have been made. So little was known, during the earliest years of our publication, of the aim and objects of anthropological science, and of the existence of a society for its promotion, that considerable sums of money were expended in advertising our *Review* and the Journal of the Society, which resulted in a number of persons becoming subscribers during the first year. These subscribers, learning through our pages the particulars of the Anthropological Society, almost universally joined the Society the following year, instead of remaining independent subscribers. The same thing has continued up to the present time, our external circulation remain-

ing almost in *statu quo*. Several hundred pounds have been expended on the *Review*, and it was thought, by competent judges, likely to become a good property ; or, at least, that it might be worked so as to repay the money expended to establish it. An application was made during the year 1864, to reduce the price of the *Review* to the Society ; but an investigation of our finances showed our liabilities to be too great at that time to accede to the request of the Council. In 1865, further efforts were made, at a considerable expense in advertisements, to extend the sale of the *Review*, and, at the same time, promote the prosperity of the Society. With this object a number of copies were distributed gratis. A similar policy was pursued during 1866. We freely acknowledge that these efforts were not successful so far as the finances of the *Review* were concerned, but we have the satisfaction of knowing that benefit did accrue both to the Society and to anthropological science.

We were perhaps too sanguine as to the interest of the public generally in questions so deeply interesting to ourselves. Our *Review* was, we admit, in 1865 and 1866, financially a failure. Numbers of unsold copies of these years may now be had at a merely nominal price ; and a gift has been made to the Society of a quantity of back numbers for the benefit of future members. The end of the year 1866 brought the commencement of the great financial panic. It is curious to watch the effect of financial prosperity, or its reverse, on the progress of science ; and our publication, in common with nearly all others of a scientific character, suffered from the depression of trade in 1866, and which has, indeed, continued more or less up to the present time. We decided, therefore, in 1867, to print fewer copies of the *Review*, and also to economise our expenditure as far as possible. Since that period our independent circulation continues steady and, on the whole, satisfactory.

It is not for us to speak of our own labours during our six years of editorship. Our work has been a labour of love ; but that it has been an arduous one, those who have attempted a similar undertaking will readily credit. Nor need we assert here our zeal for the cause of scientific progress, and our warm interest in the prosperity of every scientific body which strives to do honest scientific work.

Some remarks have been made against the anomaly of an independent *Review* being supplied to the Fellows of the Society. This is a question which we hope the Fellows of the Society will fully and freely discuss. We believe that an *Anthropological Review* is a necessity of the time. That it has helped to establish the Anthropological Society we feel equally sure. We do not pretend, however, that the present arrangement is the best which can be found. The subject of the pre-

sent and future connection of the *Review* and the Society has ever been one of great anxiety to the originator of this *Review*. We believe that it is to the interest of all parties, and to the advantage of science, that this subject should be fully discussed and finally settled. It is one of paramount, if not vital, importance to the Anthropological Society. If the Society will undertake the management and control of this *Review* we shall be extremely glad. We cannot see the least reason why it should not do so. The Society would have to nominate an editor, and it could then exercise some amount of influence over its pages. At present they have no risk, and consequently no control. That at an earlier period it was judicious for the Society not to accept the copyright and management of our *Review*, we cannot doubt. Now, however, the matter is changed. The *Review* is at present worked by trustees, and the profits, should there ever be any, will be devoted to the foundation of a Medal in the Anthropological Society. The originator of the *Review* has reserved the power to manage the editorial department for life. If, however, the Anthropological Society will accept the copyright and publish the *Review*, it will be handed over to them unconditionally. All we say is, that an *Anthropological Review* is a want of the time; and we shall always be glad to do all we can to establish it on a solid and, if possible, a lasting footing. On surveying our past history in connection with this *Review*, we feel that we have been engaged in a good work. We defy any honest man to charge us with merely representing the views of a faction or a clique. On the contrary, it is known to every student of Man-science, that our pages have always been open to writers of every shade of opinion. We do not profess, nor has it ever been our desire, to show more favour to the doings of the Anthropological Society, than to any other learned body. Our object has been to act as a medium of communication between students of every branch of anthropological science. Nor are we aware that we have shown that very common defect amongst the generality of scientific men of the day, viz., of restricting the limits of the science of man. On the contrary, it has been our object to conduct this *Review* in a truly catholic spirit. At the risk of giving offence to a large class of our readers, we have opened our pages to theorists and speculators of every description. Our past and present will be an index of our future. We shall still continue to disregard the feelings and wishes of party, and do all we can to become the organ of genuine free science. All we ask of our contributors is, that they should write in a scientific spirit, and base their speculations and theories on either ascertained facts, or logical inferences.

With regard to the issue of the Journal of the Anthropological

Society at the end of this *Review*, that may disappear at any moment. The Fellows of the Society will consider their own interest and pleasure in this matter. Their decision will in no way affect the general principles on which this publication will be conducted in the future. The Anthropological Society of London has now become one of the recognised institutions of Europe ; and we have little fear that it will in any way be injuriously affected by any change that it may think it advisable to make in its organisation. All we hope is, that the Fellows of the Society will be guided in their decision solely by a desire to benefit the cause of science. We have little doubt that such will be the case ; but we feel it our duty to give here a warning. For a long time, we know, it has been the object of a small but influential band of scientific men in this country, to do all they can to ruin the *Anthropological Review*. That object has long been aimed at ; now it is openly avowed by some whose praise we should consider the highest censure, and whose denunciations we look upon as our well-earned recompense for our past labours. Some parties formerly directed their thundering denunciations at the Anthropological Society. In this they signally failed. The attacks on the Society have only made it take root more deeply and more firmly. Having, therefore, been foiled in their attempt at that time to injure the Society, they now intend to make war upon this *Review*. This does not at all alarm us. We know the strength of our enemy ; but we know more—we know their weakness. In the past we have been very chary in dealing with those who have attacked us. If such beings had a spark of gentlemanly feeling, we would argue with them ; as it is, we merely look upon them as curious objects of study, in whom one characteristic which belongs to all genuine scientific men is utterly absent. There are other antagonists, however, who are gentlemen. We shall always treat them as such. Honest competition and fair rivalry we consider both necessary and laudable. We are ready to take our part in a fair combat for the victory of anthropological science, without any support or encouragement of any sort from the Anthropological Society. On the contrary, we believe that some of our contributors occasionally feel hampered in the expression of their opinions by the connection which exists between the *Review* and the Society. We trust, that whatever may happen, they will no longer feel this. It has been suggested to us, that in this number we should hang out our future flag, whether the colour be white, red, or black. We must, however, decline to accede to such a suggestion. We feel too much contempt for those who attack us even to take the slightest notice of their ebullitions of spite and jealousy.

One of our oldest and most valued contributors, a short time since, sent us the following :—"There was a report that one of the indispensable conditions of amalgamation was the suppression of the *Anthropological Review*; a suicidal course, the meaning of which it is very difficult to divine."

Let us here say, once for all, that it is out of the power of any society, or any body of men, to "suppress the *Anthropological Review*." Such threats only show the silliness and weak-mindedness of those who make them.

The prospects of this *Review* were never better than they are now. Our labour as editor is daily becoming lighter, and our contributors more numerous. We are still anxious to acquire assistance from others; because it is most advisable to get all the variety of ideas and expressions which we can command. Our warmest thanks are due to the friends who have worked with us without fee or reward of any sort or kind.

In another place it will be seen that we have had for a moment to raise our visor, and to ask those who desire to attack the management of this *Review* to strike their blows direct at ourselves. We have done this merely to save others. We thought it best to come forward and receive on our own shield the blows that were being hurled at the Council of the Anthropological Society of London.

The rage and animosity of our assailants is a better guarantee to us than any other that we are doing good work. We only hope that they will continue their attacks. It has been said that no institution or undertaking must be considered safe until it has been well attacked. It is for this reason we hail the assaults made on the *Anthropological Review* and its connection with the Anthropological Society. If the connection is unsatisfactory and cannot be defended, by all means let it be destroyed. The connection, say our opponents, is unique; it is unprecedented! We partly acknowledge it is; and glory in the fact. The question now to be solved is not whether it is unique or unprecedented; but whether it is sound for the interest of anthropological science that it should be maintained? If not, by all means let it be destroyed.

At present we believe that the connection which exists between this *Review* and the Anthropological Society is a sound one, and that it can be successfully defended, as it is of interest both to the Anthropological Society and to the progress of anthropological science in this country that it should be maintained. The attack made by some kind friends on ourselves is a mere illustration of race peculiarity, and arises, we believe, from the cordiality with which the Saxon hates good government. The Saxon is said to hate all successes and

every man that has power. Saxons hate us doubly, because we tell them so. We have generally noticed that those who attack us belong to the stupid Saxon type who neither understand nor appreciate the scientific spirit of the age, and whose inordinate vanity makes them suppose that every one else is like themselves. Thus it will be seen that we can study comparative anthropology without going far from home.

The success of the Paris Anthropological Society is, we believe, entirely due to the absence of this Saxon element. Across the Channel they glory in good government, and adopt the best and most powerful organisation. Thus, in the Paris Anthropological Society, it will be seen that Professor Broca holds the perpetual office of Secretary-General, and has more power than any officer in the London Society. This does not give rise to jealousy, but to gratitude. We do not at all complain of the partial difference of feeling which exists in England, because we look upon such jealousy as inevitable. Every man who has power, or who dares to lift his head above his fellows, is hated by both the educated and uneducated Saxon boor.

A short time since Professor Broca when in London was entertained at a dinner by a select party of anthropologists. In answering the toast of his own health, he gave a most interesting account of the rise and progress of the Paris Society, and dilated especially on the beneficial influences which the promotion of the London Society had exerted on the progress of his own Society. He went on to say that the Societies of Paris and London were very much alike. Both had *Memoirs* and both had *Journals*. The London Society also published translations, but the idea of this was not new. On the contrary, one of the members of the Paris Society had, at its first formation, translated portions of Retzius' work, which was not published for want of funds. He, therefore, claimed the priority of the idea of publishing translations! Professor Broca went on to say, "But there is one thing in connection with your Society which we in Paris all admire and envy. It is your English *Anthropological Review*. It is what we long for in Paris. The existence of an independent organ devoted to anthropology in connection with your Society is the very acme of perfection. Your organisation is complete. If we do not follow your example, it is only because we want funds."

If the existence of an independent organ in alliance with the London Society meets with the approval of such men as Professor Broca, we care not what others may think or say. We will now only add, that great as is the estimation with which Professor Broca is deservedly regarded by the majority of British anthropologists, yet he is held in far higher honour by all those who have made his acquaintance. None

who heard him on the occasion to which we have referred could feel other than attracted and charmed with the man. His speech has united more firmly than ever the link which unites together anthropologists of all nations. Dr. Broca's knowledge evinced of the organisation of the Anthropological Society of London, and the relations which exist between it and this *Review*, was sufficient to shame many a British anthropologist. We are only sorry that the speech cannot be reproduced *in extenso* for the instruction of those who have hitherto been too lazy or too stupid to understand the organisation of the London Society. We shall be well pleased that they should receive their instruction from the FOUNDER OF MODERN ANTHROPOLOGICAL SCIENCE.

The prospects of the *Anthropological Review*, the Anthropological Society of London, and, indeed, Anthropological science generally, were never, we believe, so bright as they are at this minute. Nothing is more erroneous than to suppose that attacks in periodicals, or by societies, injure them.

Our enemies are often enemies of the Anthropological Society, and very generally also of Anthropological science. They would first destroy us, then the Society, and then the science.

What would not be given by some of our detractors at this moment to any one who would eradicate that terrible word ANTHROPOLOGY from the English language?

To do this the *Review* and the Society must first be destroyed. It is of course possible that they may succeed in exterminating this *Review* at some distant day, but never the Society or the Science of Anthropology.

We think that we can promise our readers that all the strength of the enemy will be exhausted in killing us. The Society will yet remain as a great fact, and Anthropological science will some day be appreciated, if not venerated, by every man who loves truth for its own sake: and it is for such alone we labour and whose good opinion we desire.

Anthropological News.

THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.
—Some wisecracks have recently made what they believe to be a discovery, but which now turns out to be nothing more than a veritable "mare's-nest." On the 4th of February last, when Dr. Hunt took the chair after his election as president, he made some remarks on the financial position of the Society, which were printed at length in some of the daily papers. The *Globe* gave